

1 SELINA KEENE, *et al.*,

2 Plaintiffs,

3 v.

4 CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN
5 FRANCISCO, *et al.*,

6 Defendants.

7 Case No. 22-cv-01587-JSW (RMI)

8 AND CONSOLIDATED CASES¹

9

10 **ORDER FOR STATEMENT OR
11 RESPONSE TO DEFENDANT'S
12 PROPOSED DISCOVERY PLAN**

13 Re: Dkt. No. 125

14 Currently pending before the court is Defendant's proposed discovery plan (*see* dkt. 125)
15 ("Proposed Discovery Plan"), as well as a series of objections thereto. The Proposed Discovery
16 Plan was presented on August 22, 2023; the same day, the court conducted a discovery conference
17 aimed at coordinating the discovery process and schedule for the Vaccine Cases (*see* dkts. 126,
18 136). As provided for during the hearing, all Parties were given an opportunity to lodge their
19 respective objections to the Proposed Discovery Plan, and several such objections were filed (*see*
20 dkts. 130, 132, 133, 134, 135).

21 On August 30, 2023, more than a week after the discovery conference, an order was
22 entered relating a new case (*Royce v. City And County Of San Francisco*, 4:23-cv-03643-JSW).

23

24 ¹ The above-styled case is the lead case in a group of consolidated and related cases (hereafter collectively
25 referred to as the "Vaccine Cases"). The consolidated cases are: 4:22-cv-03975-JSW, 4:22-cv-04319-JSW,
26 4:22-cv-07455-JSW, 4:22-cv-07645-JSW, 4:22-cv-06013-JSW, 4:22-cv-04633-JSW, 4:23-cv-00211-JSW,
27 and 4:23-cv-03139-JSW. The related cases are 4:22-cv-09045-JSW and 4:23-cv-03643-JSW. The order
28 granting limited consolidation was filed in *Keane et al.*, 4:22-cv-01587-JSW; therein, the court clarified that
any subsequent case filed in the District that is determined to be related to the consolidated cases shall
likewise be subject to the terms of the limited consolidation order (*see* dkt. 90 at 3, n.2). The consolidation
order also stated that all such cases shall proceed with the same discovery and motion schedule through
summary judgment, and that all submissions filed by any party in any related case shall be filed only in the
lead case, *Keene et al v. City and County of San Francisco, et al*, 4:22-cv-01587-JSW). *See id.* at 3-4.

1 See Order Relating Case (dkt. 131). Likely, because of the timing of the order relating *Royce*,
2 counsel in that case was not yet expressed assent or opposition to the Proposed Discovery Plan.
3 Accordingly, counsel in *Royce* is **ORDERED** to file any objections he may have to the Proposed
4 Discovery Plan no later than 12:00 noon on Friday, September 8, 2023.

5 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

6 Dated: September 6, 2023

7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28



ROBERT M. ILLMAN
United States Magistrate Judge